

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

A Transmittal Form, a Fee Transmittal form authorizing payment of fees via deposit account, and a Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time accompany this Response. If it is determined that additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-2260 in the amount of such fees.

Section 3 of the Office Action states that the Declaration does not identify the city and state of residence of each inventor. It is suggested that an Application Data Sheet or a Supplemental Declaration be submitted to provide the residence information. The undersigned has reviewed the Application Data Sheet that was electronically filed with the specification on March 9, 2001. The originally-submitted Application Data Sheet includes residence information for each of the inventors. Given this finding, Applicants will refrain from submitting a supplemental Application Data Sheet at this time. A second Application Data Sheet can be provided, however, should the Examiner so desire.

Sections 4 and 5 of the Office Action request amendment of the Abstract. An amended abstract is being submitted in this response. It is believed that the amendments will satisfy the concerns regarding the length and content of the abstract.

Section 6 of the Office Action requests that a Field of the Invention section be added to the Background section of the specification. The amendments presented herein add a Field of the Invention section as requested.

Section 7 of the Office Action requests that a portion of the information contained in the Cross Reference section be deleted. The undersigned believes that the second

sentence of the Cross Reference section is not duplicative or redundant information. The first sentence claims the benefit of the referenced provisional application for priority purposes. In contrast, the second sentence is a reference incorporating the entire content of that provisional application into this regular utility application. Consequently, it is believed that the Cross Reference section need not be amended.

Section 8 of the Office Action objects to Figure 3 because reference numeral "300," which is included in the text in paragraph 61, is not included in the figure. An amended Figure 3, containing the inadvertently omitted reference numeral "300," is being submitted with this Response. It is believed that the submission herein of amended Figure 3 will remove the objection expressed in Section 8.

Sections 9 and 10 of the Office Action reject claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,223,202 of Elias Bayeh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,020 of Jayson Minard. Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable over the cited combination. At most, a combination of Bayeh and Minard would disclose a builder tool for an application running on one of the virtual machines of Bayeh.

Regarding the rejections of claims 1-20 and 40-48, the combination does not disclose an overview component depicting a plurality of virtual machines or a concurrently displayed parameter detail component showing parameter information related to one of a plurality of virtual machines. Rather, Minard deals with the development of a program and the management of the files related to that program. The Minard reference does not teach use of its visual development environment to develop even one virtual machine.

Regarding the rejections of claims 21-39, the cited combination does not disclose, and in particular, columns 6 and 7 of Minard do not disclose, for example, creating two relocatable virtual machines to run compiled source code of two received applications and then locating the two created relocatable machines. Minard does not operate in a multiple virtual environment. Further, Minard does not disclose the determination of parameters for a multiple virtual machine environment. The pending claims, however, are specifically directed to multiple virtual machine environments. Adding the Bayeh disclosure to Minard does not create such a teaching.

Applicants believe that the remarks and amendments presented herein fully address the issues, objections and rejections stated in the Office Action. It is further believed that the remarks establish that the pending claims are allowable over the stated rejections. Consequently, entry of the amendments and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

September 22, 2004

Date

By



Michael F. Williams  
Reg. No. 39,875  
Attorney for Applicants  
(319) 366-7641 (ext. 222)  
PTO Customer No. 24234